

Mr. Nyland: How many of you are there?

Questioner: Two.

Mr. Nyland: Good. Beth working?

Questioner: (I am just now.)?

Mr. Nyland: Good. ^{Pretty soon --} There are not enough tables, huh? And it changes from lunch to ^ameeting. Maybe just as well. What is it for today? What was left over from last week that we can warm up?

Questioner: I have a question about how one should look at other phenomena and I'm thinking in regards to Edgar ~~Cause~~ ^{Cause} in light of what we know about Work. Recently I looked at a reading, a group of readings by Edgar ~~Cause~~ ^{Cause} and it seemed that he was indicating in some manner or other some form of work which seems familiar to me and to what I knew about certain ideas about Work, Gurdjieffian Work, and I wondered how I could place that sort of knowledge for myself in regards to Gurdjieffian Work?

Mr. Nyland: Are you sure it is in that, or did you read it into it?

Questioner: That's...I'm almost sure that I didn't read them into it because I discussed it at length with other people in Work and it was in particularly the Search for God readings that I found certain similarities although I didn't find the method as such, I found certain similarities in

Mr. Nyland: But you will find many similarities like that_ you don't have to go to ~~Cause~~ ^{Cause},

Questioner: No

Mr. Nyland: particularly.

Questioner: But

Mr. Nyland: Almost all religions have similarities and if one studies contemporary religions he will see how many principles are the same. Sometimes the words are different, formulation is different, and sometimes certain things appear in one which do not appear in another, but I think in a general way they they all aim at a relationship towards a higher being and mankind considering him-itself- on earth having to go through certain stages of development in order to reach a higher level. So, if you call it God, or ^{if you call it} His Endlessness, or All Father, and All Seeing, and so forth, whatever it may be, and whatever is man on earth in different conditions in which he is interested in certain particular spheres for himself as experience or whatever he wants to include. There are

Must Remain in
Transcription Room

the similarities between people, and there are similarities between the different gods.

Questioner: Ah-But I

Mr. Nyland: You see, it's nothing unusual.

Questioner: I-I-I take it only- I- ^{bring the} ~~I~~ question ~~is~~ mainly, because of the state in which Edgar ^{Casey} ~~Casey~~ was reported to be in and how we can accept that sort of knowledge or ^{what-} whatever it was. And it...

Mr. Nyland: Is it difficult for you to accept that?

Questioner: No. It's not. But it seems to be of a different type.

Mr. Nyland: I think there are many descriptions about that kind of a state based partly on their experience and partly we'll have to take for whatever they say is; since they apparently have received some information that we ~~usually don't~~ receive. If it's a question for any one man who is either clairvoyant or ~~is~~ under the influence of hypnotism, self-hypnotism, or whatever it may be; or a person who is living for a little while under a certain influence as a shock which has brought about a changed condition either in his mind or in his heart, then-then they will say certain things in certain terminology and they will describe their experience to best knowledge they can and perhaps even try to indicate that it would be worthwhile for other people also to have that same ~~kind~~ of an experience. Now to what extent they are successful in telling you how to get there, that is again another question. But nevertheless, they will make certain statements about certain conditions and each person reading it or hearing about it will start to match it with whatever their own experience is. What then can check and say yes I can agree and to the extent that it looks as if it is feasible or at least reasonable for them they are willing to accept it because someone else has done it. And of course there is a large group of certain facts which are unacceptable to a person of a certain development when he says, well, that doesn't fit into my scheme of things, and then you have an argument. I think there is a great deal in what Casey is telling about spiritual world and if one is interested in spiritual worlds in general and the assumption that spirits even exist now or that when one dies that one goes to a different kind of a world hereafter, or across the threshold, or that ^{that} ~~what~~ one at the present time can experience by being here, by being in a certain state and then by having contact with that what happens somewhere else not on this earth. All of these kind of, perhaps theories, and facts, that certain people can verify and actually stand on and which are irrefutable, for them; I think all of that determines within a person when he views it and when he comes in contact with it

and has to make up his mind, a certain something that for him becomes truthful and other things he does not accept. All of this has nothing to do with Work; but Work, in itself, if one wants to apply it and if you believe that in that particular direction there is a possibility for evolution, and if evolution would mean for a man that he will be able to develop his consciousness and that what is needed for the development of man as a whole and becoming harmonious, then of course he has to touch, also, on the possibilities of his spiritual development for himself. And then it is very much worthwhile to think a little bit about where am I going when someone else already has described of what I can expect. I think it is interesting, when he talks about certain things, now not about prophecies, but about a relation with God and to what extent his own experience, his own education, his own christian bringing up has lead him to certain concepts. If one now compares it with what you have, and what you have experienced and what you can believe in, and what you think is right or wrong, for you; then if it agrees, then you say, 'Well, Casey is a pretty good man because he tells the same thing as what I feel.' And sometimes you argue because he says something else. But again, you see, as far as Work is concerned, it always leads to exactly the same thing: How can a man grow? How can he actually develop, how can he become what apparently he is not at the present time? And if there is nothing said of how to do it, all that remains is a beautiful description of how heaven looks and what it will be if I get there. But if nobody tells me how to open the door, then I'm up against it. So of course there is in any kind of a religion, any kind of a statement about a spiritual world. There has to be something mentioned about what you can do, in other words, you have the same kind of experience as I have had. If Casey will tell that, it will be wonderful. But as far as I know, he doesn't say very much about that. I would almost say it is very easy to describe a certain situation where nobody has been. Because no one can check up, and we judge from the standpoint where it is most plausible that you have a belief, and when it's a little bit far fetched, you say, well, maybe I have to take it with a grain of salt. I think the emphasis is much more on what your own experience is and in what particular place you think spiritual values belong. And you can use whatever someone else has told you or has written about and even if they are purported to be actual experiences, media or people who have been in contact, or actually certain spirits which speak through a man on earth and tell what they then have seen and then admonish different people to behave in one way or another. It's very good, I think, to be interested in the spiritual world and the possibilities of that; and surely not to deny it, to be

too narrow minded and to think that this life is everything there is; because naturally, it isn't. Have you read much of that kind of literature or been in contact with it?

Questioner: Just since I became interested in work, like (on back...everything) before I just criticized...

Mr. Nyland: There are hundreds of people, Swedenborg, ~~Boehme~~, Graeber. Many people. Mystics included. All cabalistic knowledge. That which is symbolism. Jung, if you're interested. Many people...you can go and look at tremendous amount of esoteric knowledge, which will give you very definitely values of a spiritual kind in which you can believe or you can verify, including the philosopher's stone. You know, there is almost, I would say there is no limit to it. But it doesn't mean that everything that is written is true and that much depends on their own personal interpretation which may not fit your own. But if one is interested in ^{Cayce} ~~Cayce~~ and all the different people who tell about what is going to happen and how can they tell and were they there and how it is when one becomes objective and then looks at certain facts of earth as they are, and what happens to the concept of time when I become less and less influenced by it. If the subjectivity of man has to be, you might call it, undone, and, for--in its place, certain objective values have to be acquired, what happens to the subjectivity of time. Logically, it must change, so that if one goes to a spiritual world one will look at the events of earth in an entirely different--from a different standpoint--(from) an entirely different life. And what ~~Cayce~~ is telling, and seeing, and actually diagnosing certain diseases, and what is the cure (of it), may have been given to him from a standpoint where that what happens on earth becomes much more objective to someone who can then oversee the beginning and the end, instead of staring themselves blind on one particular point. No, I think it's very useful. Read as much about it as you can. And think about it. And start with William James about psychic research and maybe you end up in the psychedelic section. All right. Yeah?

Questioner: You might remember a letter that I wrote to you, a very long letter, about dance a couple of months--3-4 months ago.

Mr. Nyland: Yes, I remember too well().

Questioner: Yeah. I would like to know, though, Mr. Nyland, quite seriously, if there's any--if I'm wrong in hoping that someday, if I work and if I experience long enough in my life--this kind of life--if I'll ever be able to use dance as a means of communication...()

Mr. Nyland: There's no doubt--you can.

Questioner: Is there anything that I can...Any way that I can be approaching

it now?

Mr. Nyland: Yes. Of course. Have you ever read the chapter on art in All and Everything?

Questioner: Not recently.

Mr. Nyland: Read it again. Because this is like an art performance in which one wants to communicate by means of certain, whatever it may be, dancing, any kind of a form of art—something that has, that one has, within oneself and that it tries to eliminate, as much as possible, the form, and only want to indicate that the form is a symbol of that what is living within so that the motivations of a person when he wants to dance has to do with the manipulation of his body or an expression on the face or some kind of a relationship between the different parts of the body. ~~That~~ then that totality starts to represent something that is within his heart or that at-at least it must be ^{something} that belongs to the level of his being, and that art in that sense, becoming less and less dependent on the form, but more and more on the essence, would then, for those who have actually that kind of a language and are open to it, would become a means of communicating (and [?] learning) certain things that one cannot communicate as easily by means of words. So I think it's quite possible that one can learn this as a performance. It may be very difficult for an audience to understand it from the same kind of a level and that they, as an audience, also, have to learn how to receive. So that there are ^{then} two things that are necessary when it is something that one wishes to communicate.

Questioner: Is there any ~~um~~ any way of studying it...movement and possible effects of the different lifelines from the stand of music tone relationships, things of that kind—gestures of the body...

Mr. Nyland: The only way by which you can start, is by indicating something that for you is symbolic, and to see if someone else can understand it.

Questioner: Okay.

Mr. Nyland: But you see, you're up against it.

Questioner: Yeah.

Mr. Nyland: So the first step in any kind of communication is prepare that what is ^{the sender} ~~desendant~~ and not to pay attention as yet to the receiver. So if I want to send a radio station, I have a radio station to send out messages, I ~~have~~ ^{first have} to be sure that my, whatever it is, is in good working condition.

Questioner: Yeah.

Mr. Nyland: You see, if I am sure, that that what I am sending is correct, then I can expect that someone else, perhaps, can learn the symbolic language. Now

the difficulty of actually becoming a good sender—that is rather difficult—because one is tied up with whatever the performance is and one is tied up with that what one believes this performance will produce and that for that reason, one remains identified with that what one is doing in the eyes of the audience. So you first have to free yourself completely from that what might be appreciated by someone else. So if one is now, you might say, sending, without knowing where it goes and without really caring who receives it, then you can concentrate on the necessity of how this sending apparatus should be built. I wish now to see that that what I have as a form should be a container for something that is of more value and that the real wish for communication is that what is essentially my life instead of that what is only the—the outside form. For that reason, the form has to be ethereal. It almost should not have any place. It has to be there. Because that what is the ethereal form within as essence, cannot stand on its own feet. And moreover, I live on earth so I am bound by forms, so you might say a form is a necessary evil as far as art is concerned. Therefore, the form is very important when I choose it. Therefore, also, that what I now make this form do has to conform to ^{that} what is really inside as an expression. So there has to be a relationship between the outside form and that what is essential. Now again, what is essential for me. The question is—how am I made up? What is it that is essential when I know where it comes from? Is it something from me and stays with me and is it a redistilling of certain essential qualities? Or is it something that I also have received as not coming from me which I now wish to let go through me as a channel and then put in that kind of a form? So it is two fold. A man is a man on earth and he has ideas, thoughts, feelings, whatever it may be, and of a great purity and of a very great intensity that he wants to stay within that and not, you might say, dirty it, so he wants to make sure, that that what he is giving, even if it is from himself, and what he has accumulated in his past, that that is given in such a way that it is as good as it can be. This, you might say, is self-expression. But there is another—another very definite quality that also could enter. And if one looks at oneself, as one is, how has one reached that what one has? What is it in me that I have become? Because of what? To what extent are the influences that I have been subjected to reformed by myself as an interpretation. Or to what extent have certain things influenced me? And starting from different people who were responsible, like father, mother, children, education, all the rest, including that what I assume to be higher forms of beings which me, on earth, also have affected. So to what extent, then, have I

been sufficiently open or porous to receive influences which were not, primarily, my own. And to what extent have I kept, truthfully, to that what was not my own and if I now wish to communicate something, there is liable to be a mixture of that ~~which~~ is my own and that what is not my own, but which, I admit, is of a higher quality. ~~So had~~ we get into a different kind of a situation because if I do it myself, as it were, it remains subjective. If it is a quality of something that is not my own, it could be called objective, and now the question of emphasis is, what should a man as an artist do? Should he continue to express certain things as self expression, even if he admits that originally they didn't come from him but came from the outside. But nevertheless went through him, which were reinterpreted and then became subjective for him, and then stayed in his self-expression; or, should he become a pure channel of receiving material from higher up to let it flow through him and then be put in the form that he considers sufficiently indicative of that what he wants to communicate or express. The question then is: to what extent is a man able to be only a channel? ^{And} That is a very difficult question because if a channel is a pipe, or some kind of a contrivance through which certain energies flow, I run the risk that if this energy is touching the sides of the pipe that a little bit of that kind of material is going to be mixed with the energy. The purer the pipe is, copper, or galvanized iron, or even gold, the less chance there is for that what flows through it to be contaminated. And this is really the process. If I say, for me, that what is of more value than I am, because I am what I am on earth, but I know that there is life in me which is probably ~~is~~ not earthly but happens to appear on earth, then if I understand what is this kind of a quality of life and I then say that in order to satisfy my logical reasoning, I will have to assume that such a form of life has come to me and is temporarily now expressed. That when all life exists not only in other human beings, but the assumption being, naturally, that it exists forever and ever, and is all—all over the universe. That then, to what extent am I responsible to monkeying with that what is life? And if I now say that that what is my channel and, as a human being, probably a little dirty, that perhaps, how can I purify myself, to use the phrase, in the eyes of God. What is it in me, that I say now I assume that I could become a worthy vessel for indicating that what is really a truth which is not of this earth. You see, the question becomes an entirely different one. What will I do in regard to that what is objective, and that ~~for~~ now, you might say, wishes to flow through me so that I will make sure that it remains objective in the true sense of the word and to what extent

am I allowed to—to mix a little bit of subjectivity with it? But try different ways, and in the creation of any kind of an art and looking at it afterwards, as objectively as one can to a product of one's own making, which is practically impossible, because there is always self-love ~~and vanity~~. Then, when one tries to see it as really something that should represent that what is a symbol, and a symbol of a certain kind which I now assume to be of the highest that is possible for me. I have to be very clear that that is actually so and not fool myself, and that if I could look at that what I have produced with that kind of an objective attitude, I will probably find that there is no product that I make, any kind of a creation, which is satisfying, and that constantly, because of this inability and my wish to continue to live and the wish to continue to communicate, that I will have towards that all the time the feeling that what I make is never good enough. This, I think, is a proper attitude. Because then it means that I am perfectly willing to sacrifice everything that comes in the way, which I; say which dirties that what is of a higher nature and that the true attitude of an artist, almost is like a prayer that one wishes to be a channel through which certain things flow without any particular acknowledgement ~~then~~ than only that it exists and without any desire that that what flows out and is communicated can be or will be ^{- will be} recognized as such. You see the emphasis is now on the pure production of objectivity and how to prepare for that. When it is there, and this is underlying, as a definite aim, one is at the right starting point, because I think with that, that what is the instrument is perfected. And then all it needs is production and in the production I will find out to what extent I still fail.

Questioner: In answering this young lady, you said that-uh-one has to understand ^{-or-} or be careful in relating experiences or expressions whether one has oneself or whether one is discharging or-or expressing or doing what one has absorbed from outside or from others. Well-uh-since we are a result of everything that we have experienced since we were born, and this makes the personality of the individual, then-uh-what you are saying, then, is that we have to-um-separate or go back to the ^{-uh-} indi-^{to} the essence of what man is when he comes on earth which is part of the infinite. I don't see how else...

Mr. Nyland: That's right.

Questioner: Oh!

Questioner: It is? Mr. Nyland:

Mr. Nyland: That is possible. [^] It ~~is~~ if man actually could recall enough about what he was. But you see, I think that is rather difficult because as one is educated, that what is really essential of self is covered up more and more, and

that the person when he lives, and he has now beautiful manifestations, that that many times doesn't contain anything of his essential value. This is one way, if I could actually go back and see what was infinite in me when I was born, at the time I took on a form, that then if I could recall it, I have two difficulties. One is I really cannot recall it, and in the second place, if I could recall it, that what I would have to use for expression has become subjective. So you see, the only way by which one can get out of it is by developing something that is independent of my subjectivity. If I could create something that could become a certain form and I call it simply the actualization of potentiality of man, that, ^{that} then, if that could be created this time, because I wish to create it in an objective sense, then it would become a vehicle for actually expressing that what is essentially within. And then that, instead of man as he is now, would become a good channel for anything from—coming from the outside (influence). There are two ways, you see, and theoretically, they are equal; but practically, one is impossible.

Questioner: I see—could you, could you just go over the other way once more—do you mind?

Mr. Nyland: No. When a child is born, there is something put in in the form of life, and the form is not yet sufficiently developed. It grows, it acquires certain characteristics as it is living,

Questioner: Right.

Mr. Nyland: and in the beginning years there is an inhibition process in which the child is living very much with its essence on the outside. As soon as it becomes educated, and as soon as it becomes, you might say, possessive of itself, that is, that it starts to realize that it is a little person on its own,

Questioner: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: the form becomes more and more crystallized.

Questioner: Right.

Mr. Nyland: It loses then the contact with the totality of where it came from. In the beginning, there was that, life for life, it was everything, and it didn't matter if it was this or that or that. And even the form doesn't matter to a child. But we tell the child to recognize the forms. We even tell it that the form has a name. We don't allow it to say that Willy and so forth wants ^{that}; we say you say I want it, and immediately we crystallize part of that essence into ~~the~~ manifestation. And it is a terrible thing, because a baby is essentially beautiful because of its infinity, and if that is covered up, then it takes a long time before one actually can uncover it and the more one becomes educated,

the more studious, the more clever, the more developed, the more one has ability, the more one has pride and vanity, the more one is identified with one's self, the more difficult it is to reach one's essence.

Questioner: Just one question. Thank you very much. Um—previously, when this gentleman spoke about Edgar Casey—I've read some of his books. Uh—what do you think of the Art King in the Book of Change?

Mr. Nyland: Oh, very much.

Questioner: I have developed a great love for this...

Mr. Nyland: Really?

Questioner: Yes, and I find it during this time ^{-uh-} very helpful, and -uh- have an understanding that I can't always follow because of these things I've acquired, you know, but I seem to know and feel that there's a great deal of truth and knowledge—a great deal of direction, if we (can get at it) you know—(?)

Mr. Nyland: The I Ching is a very sacred book.

Questioner: Yes, I know.

Mr. Nyland: And the attitude ^{that} one should have, in using it, ... (3 seconds) (blurred section)

has to be one of (heaven)

Mr. Nyland: It's not a ()

Questioner:

Questioner: I do have that, definitely. It's a book of divination.

Mr. Nyland: Well, whatever it is, the attitude has to be proper.

Questioner: Yes, my attitude is definitely proper, but I was wondering how you ^{I find it very helpful and I () use it.} felt about it. In fact, I had an interesting experience. We asked a question of it four times but in different ways and the I Ching said that it's not necessary to keep changing the question, the answer was already given. Which is really...

Mr. Nyland: (It was) a very wise remark.

Questioner: Which is really very uh—

Mr. Nyland: Revealing.

Questioner: Yes—thank you very much.

Mr. Nyland: Yeah—that's right.

Questioner: Sir, I'm a guest and have no direct connection with the Gurdjieffian works, so perhaps my question is naive; but I would like to know, do you believe in the soul and also that the soul is reincarnated into various earth expressions as well as on other cosmic scales?

Mr. Nyland: It depends a little bit on your definition of a soul. When you say do you believe in soul. Your soul? My soul? Anybody else's soul?

Questioner: All souls, I guess.

Mr. Nyland: Do they exist?

Questioner: Yes

Mr. Nyland: You see, that's where we differ.

Questioner: (Well I^{Why?}).

Mr. Nyland: That's where we differ.

Questioner: I don't understand where we differ.

Mr. Nyland: Does your soul exist?

Questioner: I ask you— do you believe in the existence of a soul?

Mr. Nyland: What—my own?

Questioner: No. Souls.

Mr. Nyland: In general?

Questioner: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: That there are souls in existence?

Questioner: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: Yes.

Questioner: And^{then} that these souls reincarnate in earth expressions and on expressions on other levels.

Mr. Nyland: It might.

Questioner: It might?

Mr. Nyland: Quite possible. Not all souls, but there are possibilities. I'm sure that there are souls which have to come back. I think ~~that~~ there are souls that are incomplete; and that, of course, implies that the soul has to be built. So there is no soul that exists in its full grandeur. As far as we are concerned, they exist outside the limitations of ourselves when we live on earth. Souls exist in the universe and they are complete and they have nothing to do with earth. And they never need to return to earth.

Questioner: May I...May I ask where...

Mr. Nyland: Where they exist?

Questioner: Ah, no, where did you have access to this...

Mr. Nyland: Oh, that is too private.

Questioner: Oh.

other Questioner: I didn't hear the last remark.

Mr. Nyland: Too private.

Questioner: I see, thank you.

Mr. Nyland: It is like asking why were you born? There are certain things one doesn't discuss. You know. There are certain things that one ~~discusses~~ only discusses with one's own God.

Questioner: The only reason I ask, sir, is that...

Mr. Nyland: No, it's all right...

Questioner: I mean...

Mr. Nyland: I understand why you ask. It's quite all right.

Questioner: Is that—I have read different interpretations () put it this way and I just wondered where you...

Mr. Nyland: The only way ~~by~~ which you can verify it is for yourself. Because it won't help if you know that someone else thinks one thing and someone else thinks something else. Well, what else—yeah?

Questioner: I've often wondered, um-if there's any legend or meaning ~~behind~~ ^{behind}...

(blurred section)
(7 seconds)

Mr. Nyland: I think it's only a form of unity. In prayer one wants to have as good a relation towards that what is God and to whom you want to pray. One has to show that there is nothing that is not involved in this prayer. The more unified one can be in the posture, the more there is an indication of an entity. So that really, the seriousness is determined by the attitude and the posture one has. That is, as far as one is concerned, for oneself; in the relation to that what one prays towards, one has to have the attitude and the posture of a reverence, so that that what is now clasping of hands, simply means that that what I am, I contain within myself. It's quite different from that what is asking or that what one wishes to be given when the hands are open and are stretched towards God. There are two different postures possible. Both belong to prayer.

Questioner: I'm (also interested) in this work and I would like to know how does one begin self remembering and how...

Mr. Nyland: Have you read ever anything?

Questioner: Yes. Well, I'm reading the Nicoll book and I've read Ouspensky In Search of the Miraculous.

Mr. Nyland: Yeah. Forget about Nicoll.

Questioner: Excuse me?

Mr. Nyland: Forget about Nicoll for a little while. Don't read it.

Questioner: No?

Mr. Nyland: Ouspensky, alright, with reservations.

Questioner: Well—why not Nicoll then? Too complicated? ~~No~~.

Mr. Nyland: No. Too interpretative. It's not correct. It might even lead you astray. But stick it out with Ouspensky for a little while. It's quite all right. What do you know, now, from what you have read? What do you think is involved?

Questioner: Well—I'm not sure— like it's very — I read it and I — as I read

-uh-

it I feel that I—uh you know, that I understand— I feel it very much, but then of course as I— as I don't read it, then I forget about it, you know, it's very hard to—um—to begin—uh—nowhere to begin ^{on} (or)...

Mr. Nyland: Yeah. But when you feel it, you have to have something else, actually, because one is a human being; by feeling you cannot live. Not alone. Not only feeling. There is always an attitude expressed physically, and there is usually a formulation expressed by means of your mind. It doesn't mean that all feelings should be formulated, but when it has to do with a—a definite way of how to go about becoming conscious you have to have some kind of a knowledge. Now, either the knowledge can come from your feeling, and then reside in your brain, as a fact which happened to be there, although it may not have been reached intellectually. Or, it is a logical building up of certain concepts which then becomes clear in your mind and if possible, should give you an indication of what to do. So I think your question is quite right, you see, but your feelings won't help you. You have a good feeling about reading ~~the~~ ^a book and that what he says may be right and truthful and so forth, enjoyable or clever, or whatever it may be. But what is it for you that you now want to extract from it. Is it all right—here it is, he talks about objectivity. What do I do now? This is what I ask, you see. How far have you gone in extracting from the book a certain way of how to go about it, or a method, and the fact that you ask the question surely indicates that you don't know. Which is right? Nobody really knows; what to do about it, until they are told. That what is meant is a development of something in a man of that something he does not possess and which he wishes to become. So that the growth of man, you might say, is stunted at a certain place and dependent on that what is the condition of earth where he happens to live, that ^{the} aspiration of man, as he is living, he hopes that he reach—that he can reach even on earth, a certain state of independence in which he then is free from the bondage of earth and then you might say, if he dies physically, that he could —could go on to higher levels of being, or at least, the assumption is, that that what exists outside the earth is still of a certain quality although a little bit finer and more ethereal, and that the totality of everything existing belongs to His Endlessness as a personification, one might say, or using the word god for that particular concept. That man feels, to a certain extent, that he has an obligation to do more than what he is doing at the present time, that ~~if he leaves~~ ^{it} simply to that what happens to be on earth that ~~there~~ ^{it} is practically an end and it becomes repetitious in the end, and the end of his life. But if he has ambition and aspiration, and afterwards an

inspirational force within himself, that he wants to become something else, he will want to know what to do. So he goes, to either a philosophy or a religion, or he tries to find it by means of art as a creation or a concept of science in which he is satisfied that that will be the answer to that what are problems for him. If you take it religiously, you can say I go and join a church or a congregation, or I read religious books, or I pray to God, if I assume that he exists and if I can assume that he will listen to a prayer when he hears it, that he also then, will tell me what to do about it; and there are a variety of different ways ~~by~~ which one can start to bring a contact between that what ~~(the one)~~ is now, and that what is of a higher level and then hope that I can, by means of certain, let's say, instrumentations, by certain attempts that I make, will reach that higher level. If I'm a mystic, I want to clarify the relationship between me as a sinner and that what is a human being with that what I call God, who is pure. And that in sacrificing certain things for the purpose of reaching that higher—higher kind of a level, I'm willing to forego all the different pleasures of the earth, in order to become a saint. But you see, the difficulty is, that if one wants to work on oneself, there is a oneself that one has to work on, and the implication then is, that this oneself has to grow up into a kind of an entity, which, you might say, would be acceptable to God, or, for myself, will enable me to become free from earth. If that what is earth for me, I call subjectivity, it is obvious that if I want to become free, then I have to be free from subjectivity in any kind of a form. And that therefore, I say, I wish to become objective, or I wish something of me to be objective, even if it is potential now, that it can become an active quality for me, that can be useful. So how do I, as I am now, hundred per cent subjective, become objective? Because if objectivity is in the direction of that where I want to go, a higher level of being, ultimately, reaching God or becoming one with him. That then this necessity of learning now how to become objective, is very essential. This, you might say, is then work on oneself, in order to reach that kind of a state. I start in a very simple way, by the assumption that that what I wish to be objective already exists for me, and exerts an influence on me ~~then only~~—in only one way; by observing that what I am and that what—that what is observed wants to receive as facts of myself, should be facts of an absolute objective nature. Now by objectivity I mean that there is one thing only, without interference of anything else. This would give me an objective judgement. Whenever I talk about an intellectual capacity, that what is intellect should remain completely pure as intellect, without interference of anything of what we call other centers.

Questioner: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: You understand what I mean by that—by centers?

Questioner: Um hm

Mr. Nyland: We assume simply that man consists of three centers, which overflow into each other. ~~And one says is~~ physical, which is obvious, intellectual is also obvious, and that what is feeling is taken care of in certain emotional states. And that these three centers in a personality are constantly interchanging between each other and that energies received in any one of the three, is used by any one of the three in turn. I simply mean that when I have a thought, I usually have a feeling with it. I have a judgement, a liking or a disliking; usually a thought, if it has any particular meaning, goes over into an activity; whenever I have a feeling, I have an expression of my body. I naturally will have to express it because the feeling in itself cannot express it. I wouldn't know how. I have to say it, or I have to show it. So usually, whatever the feeling may be, it becomes apparent in a tenseness, or in a certain behavior form, of my physical body. And if I'm vocal enough, I will say I like or I dislike this or that and so forth, have all kind of opinions, get angry, am jealous, or whatever may be involved. If that is the condition of man as I know, and when I study him and when I see myself, how I am, and how constantly the different activities of the different centers are intermingled, that they are mixed together. Then I say for them, to become more absolute or more pure, would be, if they could function independently of each other. It's a logical assumption, you see, that when I find a mixture, that I want to unravel it first, before I know how to mix it in the correct way. Because obviously, that what I am now, at the present time, with the mixed centers, I am not at all in balance, I'm thrown off balance, many, many times. I'm completely unconscious in many ways, sometimes I'm unreasonable, sometimes I'm uncontrollable, I'm not at all at ease with myself, and I very often know, that through the different centers, a great deal of energy is lost, which I don't want to lose, but I lose it. I can't help it. This question of control, the question of being able to manage that what I am, and then I see that in this energy which is given to me, or, at least I find myself with it, an attitude that the responsibility to maintain it and to use it in the best way because I think my conscience tells me that I ought to do that. When I now see that it's impossible for me, I start to ascribe it to a tremendous loss of energy, which is superfluous, in using it in certain centers, either one or two or the three together, in which I, if I could save that kind of energy, ^(flowing?) (throwing) into it, I would save a great deal of energy, and become more controlled. So the

question then, is, how can I make my mind independent of my feelings? It's really a problem because I know that my mind, my feelings sometimes work together, and sometimes they are in conflict with each other, but in any event, they have a relationship. How can I prevent my mind being followed by an activity? How can I prevent my mind by saying certain things that conform to that what I think? If I could start with a pure activity of the mind in recording facts as they are, without any interpretation whatsoever, without using any associative forms of thinking, I would have a pure fact, and I would call it absolute, because it would be free from interpretation and therefore, free from subjectivity. So now the question is, how can I become, really, in that sense, objective? I know that I, as I am, as a personality, cannot be objective. I have to use something, that I say, for the time being, I will create an "I" as if it is objective, and now I wish this "I" to become observant to me and collect facts of me which I wish this "I" to record objectively. You see, now I have a mental function; something that will function as a receiving apparatus of a mental kind. I call it an "I," and this "I" now is functioning objectively regarding myself and collecting these data. The beginning of work, is I try to imagine, and, for the time being, it is imagination, as if there is something that could function in that way, and that what is being observed is myself, because that is what I am interested in, and in order to make it easier for the I to try to function, is that the observation only is related to that what is physical behavior. So how do I start to work? I walk, and I imagine that there is something in my mind which becomes observant of my walking. I move my hands, arms, I have a posture, I make gestures, I have a tone with which I speak, and I have an expression on my face. Those are physical manifestations. I have tensions in my muscles belonging to my body, I have also a breathing apparatus which functions; all these things are physical behavior forms and they are possible that something of me could become objective to them because there are in these forms of behavior, not the necessity that I have to like them. They can be completely neutral to me, and particularly when they already are habitual forms of behavior. So the idea of work is, that something in me starts to exist while I am active in life and that that what is now observing is observing only that what I am, and what I am as personality, what I am as physical body, whatever it is that my behavior indicates, I do not question it; I simply accept. I accept the fact of this body, existing and behaving in one way or the other, without describing it, so that as I walk, something is with me which observes me. This observation has to be impartial in order to become objective and that makes a great difficulty because I am all the time, whenever I happen to even think of myself, I'm ready to just

judge myself or to classify. And the ^{third} ~~certain~~ requirement is that I want to be free in this mental process from associative forms. That is, I want to eliminate all kind of thoughts about that what I observe. I don't want to classify it, ~~I don't want to let go into my memory,~~ I don't want to be affected by anticipation, I don't want to have anything to do with that what is not reality for me, which belongs to either the future or the past. And ^{the} only reality for me is the moment of existence as a present. So this introduces the third requirement of simultaneity. The instantaneousness-in which that what is absolute can be absolute without interpretation. And that therefore, the three necessities, ⁽¹²⁾ ~~that~~ is observation, which includes impartiality, and which must include simultaneity. That what observes is "I", that what is being observed is "it", my body, and everything that belongs to my personality, so there is a split between two things. "I", existing to observe "I", created by me to help me as a guide. "I", trying—"I", trying to develop by "it", giving him, giving "I" the task of observing "it", and whenever in "it", that is, my personality, my thoughts or my feelings are directed towards the possibility of the creation of "I", then "I" will exist, maybe for an instant, but at least during the time of its existence, it will record certain facts about myself, and that the problem is to extend this particular duration of a moment further and further, as, perhaps, indicated by a time length, but nevertheless, enduring for longer than a moment. The terminology we use for that is; "I" is aware of "it", and by awareness I mean a special kind of mental process which is impartial. When I say that what is a state of my consciousness, which I would like to reach, I call it a conscious state which, for the time being, is only "I", as consciously recording that what I am, that is what my personality is. So the distinction has to be very clear. That what is conscious, and tries to be conscious, and tries to grow is only the "I". That what remains in existence and remains unconscious is my personality. And the relationship between the two is the indication of a method of how to work. You understand now? You'll have to think about this many times before it becomes clear—

Questioner: I know.

Mr. Nyland: But you see, it is a method—It ^{is} a very definite something that each person can do and can attempt. It is not prayer; it is not based on intuition, it is not based ^{of an ex-} ~~on an~~ on an exaggerated feeling. There are different methods to use feelings of a good kind, or intuition of a certain kind for the definite way of reaching a knowledge. But what is most important in Work is impartiality. Because partiality always binds me, always ^{identified with that what I am and keeps me} remains and keeps me tied down and bound to earth and if the aim is freedom from earth, I have to learn how to become impartial. You might say this is

only the principle, and perhaps in a very simple form; but when one tries to apply it one sees how extremely difficult it is, and only this is the principle. There is, of course, much more attached to it, in the further development of oneself, of what then is necessary and all of that, it would fill many tapes. Yeah.

Questioner: Is austerity a means of avoiding what you do for self calming and other—

Mr. Nyland: Austerity is only good to reduce the level of your being to the lowest possible level of existence. There is a result of that kind of a state, in which one is less and less bothered by the outside world, and more and more contained within oneself, and it is then possible that one becomes a little bit more essential and for that reason does away with that what distracts one in order to accomplish a relationship within oneself which is much more pure. In itself, austerity is not Work, but is a very good preparation for Work and it will also establish a relationship between the mind and the body that the body has to follow a command coming from the mind instead of having its own wishes, and the fulfillment of its own.

Questioner: Are there other means of avoiding self-calming?

Mr. Nyland: Oh. Activity. Also telling 'how stupid.' Whenever one talks with oneself, and you see that you are, let's say, in the state of self-calming, you can say 'how idiotic.' What self is there to calm, and if it is calmed, what do I do with it? Nothing. That's why I say the antidote is activity. Be busy in the vineyard of the Lord. He who does, not he who thinks or feels or says, "Lord, Lord, Lord," but those who are, actively, tilling the soil. Those who are utilizing their talents. A man, as man, never should be lazy, but he can reduce his activity to a minimum for a very definite purpose of being able to see and experience his essential qualities. All right?

Questioner: Mr. Nyland?

Mr. Nyland: Yeah.

Questioner: I'd like to ask a question on this explanation. Uh, you gave three words, observation, impartiality, and I didn't get the third.

Mr. Nyland: Oh. Simultaneity. Simultaneity, Simultaneous, Instantaneous. Moment.

Questioner: Yes. Isn't it very difficult, you said that, uh, jealousy, hatred, you gave some emotions, feelings were the physical body. But how does one learn to differentiate what, then, is emotional?

Mr. Nyland: Oh. I wouldn't worry about that.

Questioner: Oh, I see. Then it seemed to me so much the...

Mr. Nyland: It doesn't matter what the cause is, I'm interested in the condition of the body, and I only want to accept that condition, I don't care what caused it.

Questioner: Yes, I...

Mr. Nyland: Maybe later I will.

Questioner: I see.

Mr. Nyland: I'm interested in accepting whatever the condition is. It may come from a feeling of jealousy or hate or love or what.

Questioner: I know, but if these two centers^{these three centers} do the work for each other when they're all mixed up, doesn't one eventually have to learn to differentiate...

Mr. Nyland: Oh, sure.

Questioner: Which one is

Mr. Nyland: Eventually, one has to learn

Questioner: Which one is leading one around by the nose so...

Mr. Nyland: Eventually, one has to learn All and Everything.

Questioner: I see.

Questioner: Doesn't hardly seem possible that these two centers could be separate, but I believe they are. But it doesn't seem possible but they could be because this...

Mr. Nyland: I think you're quite right.

Questioner: Right?

Mr. Nyland: It looks like an impossibility.

Questioner: These two particular...

Mr. Nyland: Yes, that's right.

Questioner: Right.

Mr. Nyland: Very difficult, because they have almost—they are like ingrown toe nails.

Questioner:^(Tom) Mr. Nyland, while you were gone, um, one of our meetings was more or less sort of wasted in discussion about the word personality and I was the one responsible for initiating the discussion.

Mr. Nyland: Such a burden.

Questioner: Um, I've been listening, um, to the various tapes, and perhaps my confusion comes because at times you do seem to use personality in different ways. I had thought it to be simply the totality of oneself as expressing oneself in the world, yet sometimes you say, personality expresses itself through the body or through the feelings and it does seem to me that this—that there's a difference and this is confusing. Is personality simply a theoretical construct that we use to mean the totality of ourself?

Mr. Nyland: No. I think personality is when you put yourself on the scale and you weigh yourself. The hundred and eighty pounds or whatever it is, ^{is} all personality. But there are different forms of life in personality and they're made up, or course, whatever the cells are of life force within them. And I think that certain cells are combining in some way or other and form organs and that each organ has a definite function to fulfill, and that perhaps the relationships between the cells as cohesion simply make the body for whatever it is, and it stays together, doesn't fall apart. But I think that the functions of a personality will create the impression of sometimes the part of a personality, and sometime its totality. Still it remains personality tinted. If I say certain things, it's only a small part of my personality, that's engaged in talking. It's my mind, and perhaps a little feeling in it and then a voice and whatever goes through the lips and the mouth. If I have an expression of my body, as a posture, it is then definitely communicating a state in which I am, which by-can be read by some other person. But I'm not using any particular word for it and still, it is ^a communication. So it belongs to my personality as an expression. I think that the feeling, when I experience a feeling as I am, and the expression of that goes through a condition of my physical body or that sometimes it might takes-it might take the form of an exclamation and that I used vocal chords again for the purpose of expressing and letting at-out air as it were, that that is a result of a state of ^{an} emotional or even a feeling kind. And I think there are different ways by which a personality can make itself known. Without changing the personality, it simply means the activity of it. And if one continues in describing that, the different forms of activity of ~~the~~ personality, one comes then to the behavior forms, or the reduction of all kind of activities to practically nothing. And one can say that the personality reaches absolute zero, more or less; then he falls asleep and you can't even hear that he is breathing. A state of hibernation on the part of the personality as a physical body simply means the reduction of practically every activity within him so that all that remains is a lump of flesh with a little blood circulating through it. Whereas, the opposite, on the other end of the scale is an explosion. Does that clarify it a little?

Questioner: Not really.

Mr. Nyland: Not yet.

Questioner: I looked up the word in-in the index to All and Everything and, according to the index, the word is used in the 'from the author' in the lecture, and, there, it, personality, refers to each of the centers. Um--then I happened

to look-be reading the book, ^{and} I found the word used again, in a different place, and in this context it seemed to be saying-uh-expressing itself through the body and the so forth. Uh, examples you gave, like hibernation, or on the extreme of, of say, doing a dance, it seemed to me that they would both be expressions of personality; just at one point the personality would be at a very low point of a wish and rather quiet, and the other very active. and-uh-

Mr. Nyland: Yeah. I didn't say that they were-that they were different, they were all expressions. No, I think the three centers, if you take man number one, two, and three, you can call each one a pronounced personality, practically at the expense of the other, so that the person who's man number one, becomes a physical expression par excellence, but the other two still exist. That what becomes apparent is, of course, his physical expressions, and you can call that his personality. Personality is all around. What you are now, you are not tomorrow. At the same time, what you are tomorrow exists now, also.

Questioner: Yeah, but at the same time, we all have, you know, like bundles of things that make us us and we can recognize each of us...

Mr. Nyland: Different facets...

Questioner: because of these...

Mr. Nyland: Turn to the outside world.

Questioner: Just that-for some reason we have nothing-~~nothing~~-something out of nothing, but it seems that personality is just "it" and -

Mr. Nyland: I think so.

Questioner: and you've used the word and equated it with "it" very often. And it seems to be a simple way of grasping this because I just don't ^{know} ~~know~~ what is personality?

Mr. Nyland: No, I think...

Questioner: What is its entity?

Mr. Nyland: I think it's better not to ask the question and go on as if you know. I would not define it in order that when it happens to comes you say, now that's a funny personality.

Questioner: Now I wouldn't want to define it except that people use it in these meetings and they use it in a variety of ways and we're trying to agree on some terminology.

Mr. Nyland: Do they use it wrongly? Or you think...

Questioner: I don't know how-what they mean when they say I'm trying to reduce my personality or my personality is doing that, or this, or I'm trying to change my personality, and so on.

Mr. Nyland: Can't you make, can't you make out what they mean by that?

Questioner: I have to try to put myself in their place...

Mr. Nyland: No.

Questioner: and try to think what they mean by the word.

Mr. Nyland: Yeah, that's right. You always have to ^{do that whenever anybody uses a word. You always have to} find out what they mean by that word. Many times, it's the same as what you would mean; sometimes, they use it in a different way. But I think that problem always exists. If a person uses the word 'personality' for the expression of something that they mean by it, and our language is not very accurate many times.

Questioner: Some people apparently use the word to mean an individuality and that

Mr. Nyland: No.

Questioner: seems to be

Mr. Nyland: Wait a minute.

Questioner: exactly the problem.

Mr. Nyland: If they do that, then of course it's wrong, from my standpoint, but you see, I use the word also in a certain definite way, and sometimes, according to someone else, I may misuse it. It's quite possible. But then, one has to learn my language. Like I have to learn someone else's language. No, I think the different personality individuality is exactly the same

Questioner: Umhmm.

Mr. Nyland: as between ^{un}conscious man and unconscious man. Now, when I say con-scious, it also means conscious and conscience and world. Whereas, in the limited sense it would mean just consciousness. One always talks about personality, that what is most important, and the rest is there, it hangs on, but it doesn't become apparent. That's why I say it's a facet of a man. Men numbers one, two, and three are not sharply defined, as one and nothing of two and three. They are all there, but one is the, what we call the spearhead. Best thing, Tom, is not to have a discussion on personality.

Questioner: Okay.

Mr. Nyland: Yeah.

Questioner: I don't know if you can say anything any more about (something that just came up) earlier, um, these other realms of life, and you mentioned yesterday the book that I was reading, Breakthrough ⁽⁴⁾ through Infinity,

Mr. Nyland: Yeah.

Questioner: And I realize that when someone that I trust and know and have implicitly trusted says that these things do exist that it takes away some of the question for me, but when I try to find them for myself or to have any real understanding, feeling, (in a discussion) how to say it, I-I become more irked

by them; I just feel absolutely dragged down and (_____, [?]fight) fear and fought very much with the idea, ^{that} is there really anything else? And I can't answer that.

Mr. Nyland: I don't think you can settle the question until you would have an experience of that kind which you cannot explain.

Questioner: Is there anything that I can do?

Mr. Nyland: For that?

Questioner: No.

Mr. Nyland: In order to become more spiritual? Or more receptive or susceptible?

Questioner: Perhaps, more receptive.

Mr. Nyland: That's right. I think it is necessary to be open, and whenever you feel that you're dragged down to earth, that you try to lighten yourself a little bit and fly away.

Questioner: But those times that I've been dragged down, I've actually perhaps been ~~sitting~~ and trying to relax as much as possible.

Mr. Nyland: Probably. If one concentrates too much, you usually focus it in the direction of earth. Usually, a person will solve a problem by becoming open, instead of trying to concentrate and focus his attention on (earth). Unless it were possible for a man to focus all three centers on one; but as long as he uses only one center, he usually is in the wrong one, and the only way to counteract it is to do just the opposite, to become porous to the possibility of receiving. If the problem is between material world and spiritual, living in the material world as I know it, I try to become open to the possibilities of the spiritual world. Not the other way. And by that openness, I may be able, at such a time, I would almost say, in lightness, receive certain things which are closed to me when I'm happy. If I don't experience certain things and I believe still in the validity of them, I start out by assuming that it can exist, you see, until it's proven that it cannot exist. But if I'm prejudiced, I start out by saying it cannot exist; I am from Missouri. I don't know what other state we would have to choose, you know, to be more open.

Questioner: Good choice... (link section...)

Mr. Nyland: ()

Mr. Nyland: If one is really interested, it is far better, then, either to be open, or perhaps read certain things that are more and more convincing. The verification of such events for oneself depends entirely on what one is capable of. I can read about clairvoyance but not being it, it will remain a closed book and I will stand in awe, and I say, yes, there are facts that are told, which are verifiable, and nobody else knows, and so and so tells me and where does that knowledge come from.

And ~~then~~, of course, I start to wonder if it exists or not. But you see, there are many questions of that kind, many problems. ~~If I say~~ I pray to God, I say, no, He doesn't exist. Someone else prays to God, says sure He does, because I heard Him, or I talked to Him yesterday, or what it is. Now will I take the other person's word, or will I take my own. If it is something that is not verifiable for me, many times I have to take someone else's word. I say that the water boils at 100 degrees centigrade. How do I know? By putting a thermometer in there—then I read it. But that's not all, how do I know ^{that} the thermometer is accurate? But do I have to go back to the life of Celcius who established the fact that water boiled at a certain temperature which he called 100. And then he made a thermometer out of it. But I use constantly, all kind of facts which have been verified and have become for people as they live now, something on which they can stand. And all of it is combined in working hypotheses so ^{that} the person actually can start until they find again certain facts which cannot be verified and do not agree with the working hypotheses, ~~and~~ I have to change ~~them~~. And, in fact, many things are still subject to change until I say they become ax- absolute, and then I use the word axiom. When something is axiomatic, there is no further question, I cannot be axiomatic about spiritual values until all of humanity would acknowledge the same thing. I never can become axiomatic about objectivity until everybody sees or receives or experiences same thing in the same way and uses the same words for expressing it. It's a tremendously long way to go before one can verify about such things which are of almost, I would say, infinite value, when one is constantly limited by one's own form, and there are many things excluded for several people and it doesn't mean ^{that} all of them are all alike. I may have something that someone else doesn't have, someone else has something that I don't have. But the totality of all mankind, experiencing at any one time, all possible experiences for man, is complete. That's the interesting thing. That everything that can happen, happens now, at this moment, somewhere. You understand now, what I mean?

Questioner: Right.

Mr. Nyland: Yeah.

Questioner: I work on myself, not nearly as much as I want to. Would you be able to suggest something I could do?

Mr. Nyland: Work more on yourself. There's no answer. This is not something that is given on a golden platter and fed with a spoon. It is something that is done because I wish. If I don't have the wish, I don't do. If I have no interest, there is nothing. If I'm dissatisfied and then I want to change it, I do something. You see, I ought to say to myself, I'll be damned if I want to stand for this condition, because I'm lazy. Then, probably, I will do something. I'm quite con-

vinced, if someone came up to you and had a gun in his hands, you would do something, unless you're petrified. If someone chokes you, you would kick him and perhaps it's a little too strong to say that if a person does not attempt to be conscious, and does not make an effort, then he's losing his life. But ^{there} are quite definitely instances of people who had an ideal and that everything they wished to do was to follow that ideal up to the moment of dying. Joan of Arc had an ideal and there was no question about it. So when I compare myself to some weaker person who says I can't work anyhow, so what's the use, I would say, go to hell. Yeah.

Questioner: Um, why-why does real life want to

Mr. Nyland: Why is what?

Questioner: Why does real life want to, uh, manifest itself through others?

Mr. Nyland: Why does it?

Questioner: Or in another way, why would God want to assume the form...

Mr. Nyland: I don't know. It's a pragmatic question- I don't think one can prove it. It is an assumption which is most logical, and which, for the time being, can be satisfying enough until I can verify it, and I will not be able to verify it until I am free from that what now binds me. How many stages one has to go through before you reach a level of absoluteness or that what is infinity. To what extent one has to, let's say, learn, or perhaps, even, suffer, that I start to realize that that what is now, is infinity; that what I call God, is manifested in man as he is now, regardless of whatever his particular behavior happens to be. I do not know this. All I can go by is that what I now at the present time see, what I have to live with, and I try to find a certain way or a philosophy of accepting the condition in which I am. That I call pragmatic, as it includes the possibility of change. It includes ^{the} possibilities, gradually, of a level, or stepwise change, until something becomes more real, going over from these kind of a finite forms into an absoluteness which I called infinity. And that I say is God, and in order to give for myself a wish to go towards that, I say, that what is now manifested to the extent that I recognize it as a manifestation of God, I would be induced to understand that what I am now and not wish to forget it. There are no other answers, and it is not possible for man to know that kind of ^a truth, but he can have an inkling of truth, and, at times, he can experience truth for one moment, and, you might say, that is enough. Because if I want to deny it, I have a perfect right to deny it. I don't have to acknowledge it. I don't have to assume the existence of God at all. I can do with my life in unconsciousness whatever I wish to do. No one can prevent it. But that what prevents me is self preservation. That what prevents me from not accepting my life is my conscience. And to what

extent that conscience and whatever there is of life in me, is influenced by what I perhaps could call ^{certain} spirits of a different kind which correct me or which are interested. To what extent these are spirits of people who have lived here with whom I had a relation and still have an interest in me, in my life, and perhaps wish to help me, in order to develop. All such questions, again, they are private questions. But one settles it for oneself. One makes out of the different problems, a working hypothesis of one's own. And, hoping, that at certain times, that hypothesis can be changed into axiomatic values. I think we-we stop, hah? It's already long after one hour's lunch-people have to go home, I mean, back to the office and not play hockey- Was it important Peter? Oh, it was just a little stretching, huh?

Alright. Next week we will meet here again. For those who were not here Monday--Monday group has been changed to Wednesday evening at ^{eight; huh, Jean? OK? At} eight o'clock same place, here, there is no more Monday meeting at the present time. Wednesday meeting in the evening is group two. For those who come to this group and want to Work, or learn to Work, who really want to find out what is meant by Work and the difficulties that are in the way, and perhaps how to solve them, or to have a better insight in that what one really is. Those, of course, are quite welcome to come to group two. This still remains on its periphery as far as Gurdjieff is concerned and only we talk about Work in relation to other experiences of life. So I'll see you next week, I hope. Good-bye.